

# The Logic of Dress—By Paul Poiret In HARPER'S BAZAR



A Silk Crepe with All the Radiant Coloring of the Orient Has Been Used by Poiret in This Gown. Note the New Muff Sleeves Which Like the Edges of the Garment Are Finished with Real White Skunk Fur.



M. Poiret Arranging a Jet Necklace So That It Falls Just Within the Lines He Wishes. It is in These Little Touches That M. Poiret Excels. The Gown is the Mourning Dress Shown on the Right.



All Photographs on This Page Copyrighted by and Published by Permission of HARPER'S BAZAR.

for a considerable period. Individuality is the Essential.

A woman is free nowadays to dress as she chooses, yet nine times out of ten she does not avail herself of the privilege. Why does she lack the courage to make herself attractive, when on the other hand she is quite willing to make herself ridiculous by following unbecoming styles in dress?

That is the curious thing. A woman considers herself clever if she imitates other women, even to the point of absurdity, and is fearful of attracting too much attention if she dares to be original.

I dislike fashions. They make all women look alike, and they reduce to one standard something which should be infinitely varied, distinctive and attractive. Routine is never agreeable. Individuality is charming.

I would have a woman dye her hair purple, if purple hair was becoming to her. At least, I should admire her courage.

PAUL POIRET, one of the most original and certainly the most talked about of the famous French dressmakers, is writing a series of exclusive articles in HARPER'S BAZAR. The articles are illustrated by photographs of his own charming and odd creations.

In the current number of HARPER'S BAZAR Mr. Poiret has a novel and interesting little essay upon the logic of dress. So unusual is the viewpoint that by permission of HARPER'S BAZAR the article and some of the fascinating photographs that illustrate it are reproduced on this page.

I would have women wear what ever is suitable to them, consistent with their social position and with the occasion. These three things are the only ones that should be considered in the choice of a dress, and they should be adhered to rigorously. For example, I consider it a crime for a woman to wear conspicuous jewels in the morning.

**Build a Gown After a Logical Design.**

Dress is an art—an art to be studied as conscientiously as any other art; and I would have the adept in it exemplify her art by dressing consistently with conditions and with her own state of mind. In other words, sad colors typify grief and brilliant hues indicate joy.

Clothes should be chosen according

to their suitability—the old principle of the Romans—decorum. But they should be worn and made according to one other principle—logic.

In my work I have always tried to be logical. I conceive an idea, or get a suggestion which I think will work out well, and I carry it out to a logical conclusion. People tell me that the gowns I create are entirely different from the designs of other makers. If they are different it is because they are logical. They are designed and executed without compromise with any fad or fashion.

That is one reason why my dresses are unusual and in advance of the prevailing mode. The so-called harem skirt, for example, was developed to its logical conclusion. It proved somewhat of a revolution when first

presented, but it is now approved.

The logic in a design should be completed. A dress showing the panter effect is illogical with a Grecian border of a divided skirt. If you want a panter, then see to it that the rest of the dress is carried out accordingly.

If your gown is to be built on Oriental lines, then have no stiff laces or Medici collars to upset the fundamental scheme. If the Tanagra is your model, then see that your draperies are exactly like those of the original statuette. Do not start out with straight lines in your design and permit them to develop into bulky curves. Build a gown as logically as an architect plans a church. Every garment, in fact, should be architecturally designed.

**Draperies, Too, Should Have Meaning.**

I abhor on a dress buttons that are not meant to button. A button is not an ornament—it is an object of utility. If it does not serve any purpose then do not put it on. A button should button, or be placed so that it might button, but placed haphazard on a dress it spoils the logic and consequently the ensemble.

Draperies are beautiful when logically handled; otherwise they are

The Back View of the Black and White Mourning Costume Showing the Skillful Draping of the Chiffon Into the Black Velvet Panel of the Wrap. The Arrangement of the Draping Carries Out the Rules Laid Down by M. Poiret in His Argument on the Logic of Dress.

An Original Poiret Model Made for the Russian Ballet. It is Developed in Mahogany Faile with Yoke Sleeves and Belt of Black Velvet. Drapings Are Gathered in a Fitted Band of Black Velvet Embroidered in Coral and Gold and Edged with Skunk to Match Scarf and Cuffs.

quite the opposite. They are extremely difficult to handle unless logic is kept in mind. A drapery must come from somewhere and end somewhere. I mean it must start, logically, at the shoulder or the waistline, and it must be caught at the other extremity by a buckle, a bit of passementerie, or an ornament of some kind. But the flow of the material must be in accordance with the lines of the gown, and there must be an apparent reason for its use. Sometimes you see draperies that come from one knows not where, caught here and there, everywhere, one knows not how; and instead of admiring the dress or feeling the pleasing effect of the ensemble, you wonder how the dress is made, how it was possible to make it hang together. To be able to move about in a dress is logical. Nothing about drapery should give the impression that it hampers the wearer. Drapery should fall naturally, and if walking disarranges the pleats, the material ought to fall back into the logical

folds as soon as the wearer is in repose, leaving the impression that no harm had been done.

Logic in a dress, to my mind, stands for beauty. Decorum and logic—these are the two things which should govern a woman in the choice of her dress. Fashions should be ignored. A prevailing mode may guide a woman—but nothing more—for the really well-dressed woman never follows it blindly.

By PAUL POIRET, In the Current December Number of HARPER'S BAZAR.

FASHION! That appalling word! At least to me it is appalling because it stands for that which I have rebelled against ever since I began designing, years ago. I never could understand why fashion is supposed to convey the idea of whimsicality and amusement. To my mind, it means uniformity and tediousness. Fashion to me implies lack of taste, because a thing arbitrarily set up as a model for everybody to follow is an insult to one's intelligence and individuality. Ever since I can remember I have hated routine, and I have been opposed to this artificial and absurd generalization which has reigned in women's clothes.

Of course there was a reason for it in olden times when sovereigns of a country set the fashions and the mechanism for weaving textiles was imperfect. It was then logical that women should follow the fashion, for the lady in waiting copied the dress of her Queen, as the most delicate of compliments. In turn, the lady in waiting was copied, and so it spread from one circle to another. At the same time, the manufacturers produced materials required for such a costume. And as it took a long time to readjust a loom for a different design or fabric, the fashion prevailed.

## The Etiquette of Cards and Calls—

By Mrs. Frank Learned, Author of "The Etiquette of New York To-day."

CUSTOM regulates the matter of cards and calls. Social visiting has an established code, and the rules should be understood which regulate visiting cards and their use.

These bits of pasteboard are required to do duty on many occasions. For centuries they have been the accredited representatives of their owners. They are the means of discharging social obligations, and the endless interchange of cards between friends and acquaintances may be truly said to keep society united. Without these useful little bits of pasteboard social debts could not be paid. Cards are very often reminders to acquaintances of our very existence as well as a step toward renewing friendships or enlarging a circle of friends.

Cards are often expressions of kindness, sympathy, condolence or congratulation. In fact, there are few things more important than the etiquette of cards and calls.

Card-leaving is necessary after having received invitations to a wedding breakfast, a dinner, luncheon, card party or theatre party. The reason is that invitations of this sort are personal. They are not invitations of a general nature to general affairs, but are an especial mark of courtesy or compliment. Church weddings, teas or large receptions may be classified as general affairs. A church, for instance, is supposed to be ample enough to hold a very large number of persons and general acquaintances bidden to a wedding. They may be present or not, as they please.

The proper acknowledgment of the invitation is to send cards on or after the day of the event to those in whose name the invitation was issued and to the newly-married pair. If in doubt as to what may be the new address of the bride, cards are sent to the home of her parents. These obvious points are explained herein because they are frequently a problem to the inexperienced. The same rule applies to sending cards in acknowledgment of marriage announcements.

On the occasion of a tea a hostess sends cards to her general list of friends. Thus she notifies them that she will be at home on a certain afternoon. They are not obliged to go. If they go, they leave cards so that the hostess may be reminded of their presence and may give them credit for coming. If they cannot go, cards are sent on the day of the tea, and duty has been fulfilled. It is not expected that a call should be made afterward.

If a lady has a day for being at home, her friends should try to call at that time.

A card is a reminder of one's call and address, and it is left whether the hostess is at home or not. It may be laid down on the hall table when entering or leaving a house or may be laid down unobtrusively on any convenient table.

Women attend to the duties of card-leaving, men being considered exempt from making calls when they have wives or mothers to leave their cards, but of course a young man must call on his hostess after a dinner invitation. It is to be regretted that some young men are

not sufficiently punctilious in making prompt acknowledgment of courtesies and hospitalities.

The general rule to remember is that a married woman leaves her husband's cards with her own when making a formal call, whether it be the first call of the season or a call as an indebtedness after an invitation. She leaves one of her cards for each lady in a family and one each of her husband's cards for each lady and one for the man of the household. If she has a son, she may leave two of his cards. If the lady on whom she is calling is at home she places the cards of her husband and son on the hall table and sends her own card by the servant. In future calls during the year it is not required that she should leave her husband's cards, unless, as has been stated, in acknowledgment of invitations. Her son assumes his own obligations in future.

The old custom has been revived of having a card "Mr. and Mrs." This simplifies matters generally, as a woman leaves one of these cards and one of her husband's cards when making a call.

During the first year or two of a girl's entrance in society her name is beneath the mother's name on a card.

Mrs. Henry Mason.

Miss Mason.

If there are two or more grown daughters, the custom is to have "The Misses Mason" under the mother's name. If a younger daughter is making her entrance to society her name may be beneath the others, "Miss Winifred Mason."